

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-16 and 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,815,081 to Motohashi (hereinafter “Motohashi”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,646,589 to Murray et al. (hereinafter “Murray”) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,497 to Parvulescu et al. (hereinafter “Parvulescu”); and (ii) rejected claims 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Motohashi in view of Murray in view of Parvulescu in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,262,657 to Okuda et al. (hereinafter “Okuda”).

In this response, Applicants: (i) cancel claims 1-30; (ii) add new claims 31-63; and (iii) traverse the various §103(a) rejections for at least the following reasons.

While Applicants believe that claims 1-30 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, Applicants have nonetheless canceled claims 1-30 and added new claims 31-63 in a sincere effort to further clarify the subject matter intended to be claimed, and thus expedite the application through to issuance. Support for the new claims may be found throughout the present specification, by way of example only, see pages 5 through 17.

Independent claim 31 recites a method of providing a dynamic alert indication to a user of a signal receiving device, the method comprising the steps of: obtaining context information at the signal receiving device; storing at least a portion of the context information at the signal receiving device; forwarding at least a portion of the context information to a context service system located remote from the signal receiving device; and automatically modifying, based on at least a portion of the context information, an alert indication mode associated with the signal receiving device, wherein the alert indication mode causes an alert indication to be provided to the user of the signal receiving device upon receipt of a signal by the signal receiving device, the alert indication being appropriate to an environment in which the user is presently located; wherein automated modification of the alert indication mode is effectuated remotely by the context service system or locally by the signal receiving device. Independent claims 47 and 48 recite certain similar limitations.

Independent claim 49 recites a method of providing a dynamic alert indication to a user of a signal receiving device, the method comprising the steps of: obtaining context information from


a context service located remote from the signal receiving device; storing at least a portion of the context information at the signal receiving device; and automatically modifying, based on at least a portion of the context information, an alert indication mode associated with the signal receiving device, wherein the alert indication mode causes an alert indication to be provided to the user of the signal receiving device upon receipt of a signal by the signal receiving device, the alert indication being appropriate to an environment in which the user is presently located; wherein automated modification of the alert indication mode is effectuated remotely by the context service system or locally by the signal receiving device.

On the other hand, Motohashi, Murray, Parvulescu, and Okuda, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 31-63.

By way of example only, no where does Motohashi, Murray, Parvulescu, or Okuda teach or suggest a context service system, or any element that could function as a context service system with respect to interactions with users, signal receiving devices, signal transmitting devices, and infrastructure, in terms of automated modification of an alert indication mode, as recited in claims 31-63.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the pending claims of the present application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William E. Lewis". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized "W" and "L".

Date: March 13, 2006

William E. Lewis
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,274
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-2946